



TITLE:

欧文要約

AUTHOR(S):

CITATION:

欧文要約. 西洋古典論集 2010, 22: 320-329

ISSUE DATE:

2010-03-28

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/108527>

RIGHT:

On the *Aegis*: Zeus and Athene

Noriko Yasumura

The motherless goddess Athene is more like a man than a woman; or, as J. Harrison suggested, she is rather a sexless thing, neither man nor woman. She appears as an equal to Zeus, and shares several qualities with him, including intelligence. The most telling, and curious, correlation is their sharing of the aegis. The phrase 'aegis-bearing' (*αἰγυόχος*) is one of Zeus' most common epithets, and the aegis itself is made by Hephaestus for Zeus in the *Iliad* (15.309-10). However, in the Chrysippus fragment, Metis makes the aegis *for Athene*. Also, in the fragment of the *Meropis*, the aegis is made by Athene herself from the skin of the Giant Asteros whom she killed in the Gigantomachy.

In the *Iliad*, Athene wears the aegis to encourage the Achaeans (2.450-2 and 5.738-42) and to fight with Ares (21. 400-414); she also casts it over Achilles' shoulder (18.203-4). Two of these passages, 5.738-42 and 21.400-414, in particular merit our attention for their connection with Zeus. In these two passages, Ares' challenge is quite easily beaten off by Athene, who is backed up by Zeus' aegis. By giving birth to Athene, Zeus acquires a counterpart who fights on his side and as his deputy, defeating his son, Ares, who might prove a challenger to his power.

It is a marker of Athene's functional affinity to Zeus that, as Zeus becomes more remote from human beings, she eventually replaces him as the chief guardian of the state and people. Athene is the symbolic representation of the rule of Zeus; she is the symbol of a new kind of state, or of the cultural renewal of Zeus' world. The concept of a strong alliance between Zeus and Athena fits perfectly both with Panhellenic ideals *and* Greek societal and moral norms, thus ensuring the continued popularity and success of Homer and Hesiod. The sharing of the aegis between Zeus and Athene could be interpreted in this context.

Das Weinen und Die Hoffnung des Odysseus Ptoliporthos

Tsugunobu Uchida

In diesem Aufsatz werden hauptsächlich drei Passagen der Odyssee behandelt, in denen Odysseus Gesänge über die trojanischen Kämpfe anhört (073-92 und 499-531) oder selber davon erzählt (λ523-37). In den zwei Stellen von θ gerät der Held, oft 'Ptoliporthos', d.h. Troja-Zerstörer genannt, ins heftige Weinen. Dies ist in der zweiten Stelle besonders auffällig, wo eben die heroische Geschichte der Zerstörung von Troja besungen wird. In der dritten gibt er aber über dieselbe Geschichte, ohne zu weinen, einen Bericht.

In der ersten Passage, wo die Rede von der gegenseitigen Auseinandersetzung von Achilleus und Odysseus nach dem Hektorsmord ist, könnte der Gesang eine Andeutung auf die Erfindung des Pferdes enthalten haben, da der Held vom Kraft sofort danach stirbt und der Held der Klugheit in den Vordergrund tritt. Und Agamemnon, der sich wegen des schon vorher erhaltenen Orakels an der Auseinandersetzung der beiden freute, konnte danach die Zerstörung von Troja aufgrund der Taktik des Odysseus vollbringen. Dieser Gesang enthält also sowohl für Odysseus als auch für Agamemnon einen verherrlichenden Charakter. Was aber Agamemnon nach der grossen Tat in der Heimat erlitten hatte, erfuhr Odysseus schon in der Unterwelt. Auch Odysseus ist, noch fern von der Heimat wandernd, im schlimmsten Zustand. Die von dem Gesang erweckte Erinnerung an die herrliche Tat von Agamemnon und sich selbst einerseits, und die elendsten Erfahrungen danach von beiden andererseits, machen einen starken Kontrast gegeneinander, was den Helden ins Weinen stößt.

In 0514-520 wird die gemeinsame Tat von Menelaos und Odysseus berichtet, mit der Deiphobos, der zweite Ehemann von Helena, ermordet wird. Danach fährt Menelaos mit Helena ab, um heimzukehren; Odysseus, der die darauffolgenden Wanderungen von Menelaos noch nicht weiß, kann sich nur an den damaligen seligen Zustand des die lange vermißte Frau wieder gewonnenen Menelaos erinnern, als er im Gesang des Demodokos den Namen des Freundes anhört. Den Odysseus, dem die Heimat mit der geliebten Frau noch weit fern liegt, läßt die Synkrisis mit dem —so scheint es ihm— glücklichen Geschick des Kollegen

ins Weinen ausbrechen. Die in bezug auf den Vergleich in 0523-31 oft dargebotene These vom humanistischen Odysseus, der für die Opfer des Krieges Mitleid empfinde, wird hier abgelehnt.

In 1523-37 erzählt Odysseus in der Unterwelt gegenüber Achilleus von den Heldentaten seines Sohnes Neoptolemos. Der lobpreisende Bericht macht den Vater freudig; doch ist diese Erzählung zugleich für Odysseus selbst eine ermutigende, da Neoptolemos für ihn etwas Korrespondierendes zu seinem eigenen Sohn hat. Odysseus und Neoptolemos stehen, wie von einigen Gelehrten gezeigt ist, in einer Vater-Sohn-Relation. Das bezieht sich auf den mit Telemachos vollzubringenden Freiermord in Ithaka. Odysseus kann hier mit einiger Hoffnung die Geschichte der Eroberung erzählen.

A Conjecture on the Trojan Horse

Koji Hirayama

In the debate about how to deal with the wooden horse, the Trojans are divided into three groups: one insists that it should be dedicated to Athena, another wants it to be burnt down or broken in pieces with an ax, while yet another suggests that they should throw it down from the cliffs. It may seem strange that the opinions of those who object to the first idea should split up in this way.

Hurling it down from a precipice is a well attested form of disposing of a scapegoat; and the Trojan horse episode may, as Burkert opines, reflect a wartime ritual in which an animal is sent off towards the enemy camp as a scapegoat to bring doom to them. One could surmise, then, that the above-mentioned disagreement over how to destroy the wooden horse was, in its archetypal form, that between those who were eager to sacrifice the (real) horse sent by the enemy and those who insisted that it should be pitched down a precipice as polluted. The opinion that they should install the wooden horse in their citadel was added to these after a horse that carries disaster was transformed as a result of rationalization into a wooden one with soldiers hiding inside.

On Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*

Kazuhiko Tange

Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* consists in its extant form of 12 fragments and its subject matters concerns Heracles' acquisition of the cattle of Geryon which is the tenth of the twelve Labours of Heracles in Greek mythology.

Heracles, who subdued the monster Geryon in the frontier, is regarded as a hero in the Greek world, but it seems that Stesichorus did not compose this poem from the viewpoint of the hero Heracles, but from that of the defeated monster Geryon.

In fragment S15 (*P. Oxy.* 2617 fr. 4+5 col.i, ii) the poet describes the winner Heracles as a cunning and cruel murderer and the loser Geryon as an incarnation of the ghastly beauty, using the simile of a poppy which suddenly sheds its petals, spoiling its beauty. It is needless to say that this simile is a conscious imitation of Homer, *Il.* 8.306-308.

Stesichorus, as Quintilian says, is a poet, 'epici carminis onera lyra sustinens' (*Inst. Or.* 10.1.62), and his *Geryoneis* is a lyric poem that incorporates much epic material.

Kalon theama: enter the corpses of the Argive generals (*E. Supp.* 783)

Sumio Yoshitake

When the corpses of the Argive generals are finally being brought onto the stage of the *Supplices* of Euripides, their mothers, impatient to see them and with mixed feelings, call the spectacle of the corpses '*kalon theama*' (beautiful spectacle). We wonder why the presumably decayed corpses can be described using the adjective *kalon*. We must consider the meaning of this word and refer to the phrase *kalon theama* in *Il.* 22.73 and the Leontius episode in Plato's *Republic* where the sight of the corpse of an executed criminal is described with our phrase in question.

Kalon theama must mean, in our context, a spectacle that evokes the image of the generals dying in a brilliant fight that deeply touches the spectators. That spectacle actually makes the mothers and the Argive king burst into wild lamentation, while the end of the spectacle once they are cremated marks the end of such emotions. The display of that spectacle would testify to their honourable death, but Theseus sends them to the funeral pyre without making any occasion for recounting their death or allowing anyone to look on the corpses, for he believes that Argives started an unjust war. Pacifism is one of the conspicuous messages of this play which mainly arises from the emotions for the corpses. Theseus, however, stands with Athene aloof from it all: he holds that everything about war should be decided with a sober mind unaffected by any emotive element of the circumstances.

Cunning Arts in Plautus' *Bacchides*

Takuma Fujii – Hiroyuki Takahashi

In Plautus' *Bacchides* we have in Chrysalus a typical cunning slave whose trickery, more than anything else, moves the play forward. The protagonist, however, leaves the stage just before the final act without celebrating his triumph. Stage action is taken over by the Bacchis sisters seducing a pair of old men and inviting them into their house, as if to reflect the change of the title from Menander's *Dis Exapaton*. No triumph, Chrysalus says to the spectators, because it is all too common (1073). Does this allude to real-life triumphs (thus Ritschl, Barsby), or to a stage convention (Fraenkel, Slater)? This paper attempts to see in the play a metatheatrical reference to the role of *servus callidus* and, from this point of view, compares the tricks used by Chrysalus and the Bacchis sisters.

Points of comparison: (1) money is gained and wasted; (2) deceptions are based on suggesting the opposite of what one's goal is; (3) victims are enslaved and deemed worthless; (4) use of slave's services.

(1): the names of Chrysalus and Bacchis are in a meaningful juxtaposition(240-42, 703-05; 53, 372-73): while Chrysalus is interested in

swindling people out of their money (218-21, 229-33, 640-50), the Bacchis sisters focus on luring them into their house to make them incur losses (62-72, 85-86).

(2): comparison of 90-91 and 94-100 (Bacchis – Pistoclerus), 988-1043 (Chrysalus – Nicobulus), and 1173-74 with 1184-85 (Bacchis – Nicobulus), shows that similar psychological tactics may be seen at work.

(3): finding it difficult to resist Bacchis' charm, Pistoclerus wonders if he is worth nothing (*nihili* 91) and, once seduced, tells her '*tibi me emancupo*' (92). The term *comptionalis senex*, used of Nicobulus swindled out of his money (976), evidently emphasizes his worthless state. The old men who are victimized like sheep well shorn (1122-28), as predicted by Chrysalus (241-42), have lost all their value (*exsoluere quanti fuere* 1135). When charmed by Bacchis *minor*, Philoxenus too admits that he is worthless (*nihili* 1157) and the same is confirmed by Nicobulus as well (1162). At the end, Nicobulus says to Bacchides '*ducite nos tamquam addictos*' (1205). Note also *grex* explicitly stating that the old men have been worthless (*nihili* 1207) since their youth, and Chrysalus calling Cleomachus worthless (*nihili homo* 904) once the deal has been done.

(4): while Chrysalus envisions selling Nicobulus as a slave once he gets his job done (814-15, 976-77), the Bacchis sisters seem to keep their slaves in service. Pistoclerus, a typical *adolenscens*, weak and wavering at the start, seems to change his role and begins to act as if he were a cunning slave (to a lesser degree than Chrysalus), making smart replies to Lydus (e.g. 125-29, 161-62), bragging about his success as if he assumed the persona of Pellio acting the role of Epidicus (206-15), and driving back the parasite sent from Cleomachus (573-611). Since *addicti* (1205) are to serve as slaves until they have repaid their debt, the old men are supposed to do some menial work in the sisters' house.

Conclusion: Chrysalus, an expert in eliciting money from people, has no further business with his victims who are, in his view, worthless. So, once his mission is complete, he just exits with all the booty to the *quaestor* (1075). The Bacchis sisters seem to use "the worthless" to create stage action. In the final act, the moment the old sheep are said to be not just shorn but mute (1138-39) and the sisters are about to exit, Nicobulus begins to speak (1140), much to everyone's surprise (*prodigium* 1141). It is as if a mute character who is supposed just to stand by (*astent* 1134) speaks out and thus opens up a new strand of action. The paradox

noted here, creation from nothing, recalls *Pseudolus* 395-405 and sounds significant for the whole play; from the *grex* we hear that were it not for such useless old men, they would not even be able to put on this drama (1207-10).

The *Menaechmi* of Plautus—Release from Captivity

Tsutomu Iwasaki

In the *Menaechmi* of Plautus there are many expressions about binding and restrictions and we find situations in which people are bound or restrained. On the other hand, some people are set free at the end of the play. Messenio who saved Menaechmus I (the twin in Epidamnus) from kidnapping wishes to be released from slavery and Menaechmus I, who is mistaken for Menaechmus II (the twin from Syracuse), agrees with him. Furthermore, Menaechmus I achieves reunion with his brother and tries to leave Epidamnus for his homeland after selling off all his possessions. The motifs of restraint and release are constituent factors throughout this play.

As far as restrictions and release are concerned, Peniculus seems the one who tries to set Menaechmus I free from his house. But, fundamentally, he wants Menaechmus I to stay in his own house, because that way he can get invited to meals more surely. So he is always on the lookout for his master just outside the doors. On the other hand, Messenio attempts to get a grip on Menaechmus II by giving him wise advice, but, ignored by his master, he fully realizes that he is just a slave. Peniculus' behavior forms a strong contrast to Messenio's. The former, who wants to be bound to the house, fails to follow Menaechmus I and loses a chance to enjoy an expensive dinner, while the latter, who deplores his state of enslavement, saves Menaechmus I from abduction and on that account is released from slavery.

It is uncertain whether the *Menaechmi* is based on any Greek original. However, we can discern a symmetrically built structure behind this play. Plautus often brings in farcical elements or Romanizes some scenes in the play to please the Roman audience, even if it may mean spoiling a well-balanced structure and

realism of the original. This play also has such scenes where the motifs of restrictions are more prominent (446-65, 571-97, etc.). Menaechmus I as the head of the household controls his family members. However, it is often the wife with a large dowry (*uxor dotata*), always scolding her husband in the house, who is in control. Outside the house, too, he is bound by various customs and human relations typical of the Roman society. Here it is emphasized that not only slaves but also free men like him, the head of the household, encounter restrictions in this social system. Occasionally he is bound by duties towards a client, a parasite or a slave, who should otherwise be subject to his own authority.

This play ends with the divorce of Menaechmus I from his wife in contrast to other comedies which usually end happily with young lovers' marriage. The story after Menaechmus I's coming to Epidamnus is not related in detail in the play. From the information provided by the prologue we are under the impression that the Epidamnian merchant was a benefactor for the kidnapped twin because he made the twin his inheritor and let him marry a wealthy man's daughter, though he committed the crime of kidnapping. Therefore the audience is likely to question Menaechmus I's behavior at the end of the play. To make this ending happy and appropriate for comedy, Plautus had to emphasize Menaechmus I's state of captivity by various expressions concerning a restricted situation. Menaechmus I loses his wealth and the status of the head of the household but he is released from his shackles and becomes a truly free person. His escape from the maze of restrictions of everyday life features in the play more prominently than the theme of kidnapping and restrictions imposed by living in a foreign land.

On the Latin Original and the Translations of Kämpfer's *Sakoku-ron*

Masahiro Gonoji

Engerbert Kämpfer's so-called 'Sakoku-ron' (On Japan's closed country) is an essay arguing the validity of Japan's closed country in the 17th century. It is included in his *Amoenitates Exoticae*, written in Latin, which is the only book he published during his lifetime. He was preparing a larger-scale book about Japan in

German, *Heutiges Japan*, which contained a lot of information he had collected during his stay in Japan as a doctor of the Dutch East Indian Company. Unfortunately, he did not see it published during his life and a large collection of his drafts and notes were left to his heirs.

After a complicated process, two celebrated books were produced by editing the drafts of Kämpfer's unpublished work on Japan: J. C. Scheuchzer's English translation and C. W. Dohm's German edition. Both authors included translations of Kämpfer's essays on Japan from *Amoenitates Exoticae*, including *Sakoku-ron*, as an appendix to their books. After publication, these two books were subsequently so successful and widely read that little attention was paid to the Latin original. Most arguments on these texts, especially *Sakoku-ron*, have been usually based on the translations (especially Dohm's). The aim of my paper is to compare closely the Latin original and the translations and to reveal some remarkable differences among them.

On the whole, Dohm's translation is faithful to the original, while Scheuchzer's is full of free, often arbitrary, paraphrases and supplements. Yet, even Dohm's translation, upon close comparison and examination, reveals differences from Kämpfer's original. Some of them are clearly Dohm's own simple errors and misunderstandings, but some are possibly his intentional alterations. In some cases he changed the positive expressions of the original into negative or neutral ones. Evidently he was highly critical of Kämpfer's excessive admiration of Japan, since at the end of his translation he placed long supplementary notes to show his objections to Kämpfer's several comments or arguments on Japan. It is, therefore, appropriate to conclude that Dohm's personal attitude is reflected in the negative alterations made in his translation.

Über „*Der Sturm auf dem Tyrrhener Meer*“ Schillers
—Vergleichende Analyse der *Aeneis* Vergils (1.34-156)—

Tokiko Takahata

In diesem Aufsatz wird vor allem *Der Sturm auf dem Tyrrhener Meer*

Friedrich von Schillers ins Japanische übersetzt. Darüber hinaus beinhaltet der Aufsatz Einleitung, Kommentar und Nachwort. In dem Kommentar werden die *Aeneis* Vergils (1,34~156) und dieses Werk Schillers analytisch verglichen. Aus der Analyse lässt sich folgern, dass *Der Sturm auf dem Tyrrhener Meer* nicht bloß eine wortgetreue Übersetzung, sondern eine Nachdichtung Schillers ist. Schiller verwendet beispielsweise eventuell konkretere, pathetischere sowie vehementere Ausdrücke als Vergil, welche die damalige Bewegung des „Sturm und Drang“ widerspiegeln. Darüber hinaus verwendet Schiller poetischere und m.a.W. gewundenere Schilderungen im Vergleich zum Verfasser der *Aeneis*. Daraus ist zu erschließen, wie er die Welt Vergils in deutschen Hexametern wiedergegeben und diese schwere Aufgabe bewältigt hat.

Anacreon's Poems Translated (or Contorted) into
Japanese *Dodoitsu* (7-7-7-5 Popular Verse)

Takayuki Yamasawa

Yamamura Bocho (1884-1924), Japanese poet of high renown, translated in the 1920's forty-five fragments of Anacreon into Japanese, of which six or nine are in the form of *dodoitsu* (popular verse consisting of 7+7+7+5 *morae* and characterised by the use of archaico-colloquial expression). His translation is from the English version (Boston 1918) by Walter Petersen, and, regrettably, for the most part full of inaccuracies or deliberate distortions, which lead to the 'Japanisation' of Anacreon's poetry. The *dodoitsu* version is no exception (for example, Anacreon throws away his shield, frightened at a 'ghost-like' reed on the riverbank. Cf. 36b Page). However, Yamamura Bocho's attempt should be highly appreciated, because that was probably the very first time Anacreon, Greek poet of love and wine, duly met *dodoitsu*, Japanese verse of love and *sake*.